DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 610 CS 505 107

AUTHOR Spitzberg, Brian H.; Lane, Shelley D.
TITLE Interpersonal Orientations: A Review, Synthesis and Critique.
PUB DATE Feb 83
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Albuquerque, NM, February 19-22, 1983).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Patterns; *Classification; *Communication (Thought Transfer); Communication Research; *Interaction; Interaction Process Analysis; *Interpersonal Communication; *Models; Predictor Variables
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Patterns; Theory Development

ABSTRACT

Defining interpersonal orientations as the characteristic and consistent ways in which individuals interact with others, this paper examines various conceptualizations and theories regarding such orientations in order to discover how they affect interpersonal communication. In particular, the paper (1) reviews work concerning psychological types; social styles; interpersonal dimensions, attitudes, and needs; personality trichotomies; performance styles; and communication typologies; and (2) synthesizes constructs from these areas into a taxonomy. Next, interpersonal orientations constructs are critiqued as they relate to communicative behavior. Finally, some preliminary steps are taken to show the utility of some interpersonal orientations constructs to a predictive model of contextual impression formation of an individual's competence in communicating. A seven-page reference list is appended. (Author/FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED264610

INTERPERSONAL ORIENTATIONS:

A REVIEW, SYNTHESIS AND CRITIQUE

Brian H. Spitzberg & Shelley D. Lane

University of Wisconsin--Madison

Madison, WI 53706

(608)263-4518

ABSTRACT

Although human communication is exceedingly complex and diverse, attempts have been made to characterize interaction in terms of behavioral consistencies, universals of human behavior, and interpersonal orienations. Interpersonal orientations constructs represent characteristic and consistent ways in which individuals interact with others (or as argued in this paper, ways in which individuals are perceived to interact with others). After describing, explaining, and synthesizing these constructs into a meaningful taxonomy, interpersonal orientations are critiqued in reference to their usefulness to communication theory and research. Finally, some preliminary steps are taken to reveal the utility of some interpersonal orientations constructs to a predictive model of contextual impression formation of an individual's competence in communicating.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Brian H. Spitzberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, Albuquerque, NM, 1983.

CS505107

The infinite variety of human interaction makes the discernment of behavioral consistencies a difficult task. Human behavior appears to defy description and explanation since it is characterized by diverse communicative acts. However, various theories have been adduced to describe and explain human interaction in parsimonious, yet accurate ways. One of the rich fields of research and theory has involved the constructs of interpersonal orientations. Interpersonal orientations represent characteristic and consistent ways in which individuals interact with others. They are "ways in which individuals are usually oriented toward other people as they attempt to communicate with them" (Patton & Giffon, 1974, p. 176). Thus, "despite the fact that people tailor their social images to interaction goals in the immediate encounter, most individuals appear to project relatively consistent over-all impressions of themselves across both interactions and time" (Leary, 1979, p. 451). To the extent that individuals do possess or present consistent orientations toward interaction with others, it is important to discover what these orientations are and how they affect interpersonal communication. In order to discover how these orientations affect interpersonal communication, an examination of the various conceptualizations and theories regarding interpersonal orientations is in order. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to describe and explain interpersonal orientation constructs, synthesize these constructs into a meaningful taxonomy, and critique interpersonal orientations constructs as they relate to communicative behavior.

Psychological Types

Perhaps the earliest systematic work on individual orientations toward objects was Jung's (1923) theory of types. Although entrenched in the outdated psychic energy concepts of the libido, the framework is still useful. Jung identified four basic pysychological functions: thinking, feeling, sensation and intuition. Thinking and feeling are termed "rational functions" because they

involve "a deliberate attitude and action on the part of the individual toward the object. In thinking, the individual interprets the object; in feeling he judges it" (Progoff, 1973). Sensation and intuition are more passive, in that sensation is the experience of an object and intuition "is a kind of instinctive apprehension" (Jung, 1923, p. 568). Thus, sensation and intuition are classified as irrational types by Jung.

Each of these types is further altered by extroverted or introverted orientations of the individual. Extraversion represents "a manifest relatedness of subject to object in the sense of a positive movement or subjective interest towards the object" (Jung, 1923, p. 542). Introversion is a "turning inwards" in which "a negative relation of subject to object is expressed" (Jung, 1923, p. 567). Thus, there are "two psychological types for each of the four functions" (Progoff, 1973, p. 96). The eight resulting types can be characterized by their communicative behaviors and interpersonal orientations (Becker, Mok, & Bledsoe, 1977; Bledsoe, 1976; Kilman & Thomas, 1975; Yeakley, 1979). Measurement of types and functions is achieved by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Buros, 1970, pp. 106-108; Lake, Miles, & Earle, 1973, pp. 186-190).

Social Styles

Jung identified an orthogonal classification of functions in which a person uses a dominant function and is oriented in one of two psychological ways. A similar conceptual system is offered by the literature on social styles (Knapp, 1978).

> Social style has been defined as the pattern of actions which others can observe and agree upon for describing a person's behavior. In particular, this refers to characterizing the behavior of an individual within two dimensional space, bounded by the constructs of assertiveness and responsiveness (Wissmiller & Lockwood, 1979, p. 2)

The dimension of "assertiveness is defined by the assurance, confidence, or force with which a person states his/her opinions . . . . Responsiveness is simply showing emotions, feelings or impressions" (Parsely & Lashbrook, 1976, pp. 2-3). The orthogonal juxtaposition of "these two dimensions in a matrix yields four social types: analyticals (low responsiveness and low assertiveness), amiables (high responsiveness and low assertiveness), expressive (high responsiveness and high assertiveness), and drivers (low responsiveness and high assertiveness)" (Snavely, in press, pp. 2-3).

The social syle construct has been pragmatically used in interpersonal communication skills seminars with the intent to increase participants versatility behavior (Burgess, Lashbrook, Wenburg, Larsen, & Lashbrook, 1980). Research involving social syle has related the construct to interpersonal perception and interpersonal attraction (Parsley & Lashbrook, 1976; Snavely, in press, Snavely & Clatterbuck, 1980), interpersonal conflict (Lashbrook & Larsen, 1978), teaching style (Knutson, 1980), occupational training (Zemke, 1976), and relational intimacy (Snavely, 1978). Operationalization of these social syles is accomplished by the Social Style Profile (Buchholz, Lashbrook and Wenburg, 1976).

Interpersonal Dimensions

The Kaiser Foundation Research Group has developed an elaborate theory of interpersonal orientations based upon the othogonal dimensions of dominance-submission and hostility-affiliation (Freedman, Leary, Ossorio & Coffey, 1951). "Leary and his associates were the first to suggest that interpersonal behavior could be represented by a circular continuum" (Bochner, Kaminski, & Fitzpatrick, 1977, p. 291), and the four "nodal points" comprise the axes of the circumplex structure. The nodal points are further divided into four "interpersonl mechanisms" (interpersonal functions of social behavioral units), resulting in sixteen units in circular continuum around the axes. "These are: Blunt/Aggressive; Competitive/Exploitative; Docile/Dependent; Modest/Self-Effacing; and

Skeptical/Distrustful" (Lake, Miles, & Earle, 1973, p. 114). Leary's interpersonal theory of personality included a description of five levels of personality: the level of public communication, conscious communication, private communication, the level of the unexpressed, and the level of values. These levels are measured by peer reports, self reports, projective tests, dream interpretations, and ideal self inventories, respectively (Lyons, Hirschberg, and Wilkenson, 1980). This functional analysis assumes "that all human behavior is purposeful" and can therefore be observed as functionally oriented (Freedman et al., 1951). This theory is proposed as a dynamic functional theory of personality, primarily meant for diagnostic purposes.

Everett Shostrom (1967) developed a circumplex model of "actualizers" and "manipulators" to describe personality types. The internal dimensions of this circumplex are based on Leary's interpersonal theory of personality. Similarly, Lefton, Buzzota, Sherberg, & Karraker (1977) developed a typology based on Leary's theory, regarding managerial behavior. Their model assumes managerial behavior involves the dimensions of dominance, submission, hostility, and warmth. Unlike the circumplex model, these dimensions are divided into four quadrants, and conceptualized in terms of their effects upon attitudes, control, involvement, decisions, and conflict. Although data reported by Leary does not directly substantiate the independence nor the order of the personality categories, the circumplex model has frequently been utilzed in interpersonal behavior studies.[1] For example, Leary and Coffey (1955) related the dimensions of the circumplex model to maladjustive behavior and obtained evidence suggesting that typical interpersonal patterns exist for (and should be used in defining) psychiatric diagnostic categories.

The Interpersonal Checklist offers the primary instrument for measuring interpersonal dimensions (LaForge & Suczek, 1955; LaForge, 1977), and it has undergone extensive revision and validity tests (Lake et al., 1973; Leary &

Coffey, 1954; Lyons, Hirschberg, and Wilkinson, 1980). Knapp, Shostrom, & Knapps' (1978) Pair Attraction Inventory (PAI) is based on the theory of Leary and his colleagues, as is Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) (Pfeiffer, Heslin, & Jones, 1973). The Interpersonal Behavior Inventory (IBI) has been assessed in terms of the circumplex model (Bochner et al., 1977) and recent research utilizing two independent methods of assessment has supported the validity of the circumplex personality trait structure (Lyons, Hirschberg, & Wilkinson, 1980).

Interpersonal Attitudes

Several other conceptualizations of personality types have created tripartite distinctions among interpersonal orientations constructs. One of the earliest attempts was the psychoanalytic theory of Horney (1945/1972). Horney identified three fundamental attitudes that individuals have regarding relations with others. An individual will possess a predominant attitude "for whom it represents the more acceptable self" (Horney, 1945/1972, p. 48). These predominant personality types are referred to as compliant (moving toward people), aggressive (moving against people), and detached (moving away from people). A compliant person needs positive evaluation from others, and therefore seeks to ingratiate and please others. Thus, "one would expect compliant people to maintain socially desirable images to gain others' esteem and friendship . . ." (Leary, 1979, p. 452). The aggressive type is Machiavellian and aggressive. The primary need of the aggressive type is control over others. An aggressive individual is characterized by a competitive desire to be successful, gain power, and achieve recognition" (Leary, 1979, p. 452). Detached individuals are introspective, private, and emotionally distant. "As a result, detached individuals would not be expected to maintain socially desirable self-presentations simply to gain others' acceptance" (Leary, 1979, p. 452). As in other typologies, individuals are thought to possess characteristics of each personality, yet be predominantly one type. The Compliant-Aggressive-Detached (CAD) instrument has been productively util-

ized in predicting consumer behavior (Cohen, 1967) and self-presentational style (Leary, 1979).

Interpersonal Needs

The term "interpersonal need" refers to "a situation or condition of an individual the nonrealization of which leads to undersirable consequences, . . . one that may be satisfied only through the attainment of a satisfactory relation with other people" (Schutz, 1966, p. 15). Schutz theorized that there are three fundamental interpersonal needs: inclusion, control, and affection. Each need has behavioral, feeling, and self-concept characteristics. As with other paradigms, an individual has qualities of each need. "In order to be anxiety-free, a person must find a comfortable behavioral relation with others with regard to the exchange of interaction, power, and love" (Schutz, 1966, p. 20). Satisfaction in this regard depends upon the compatibility of the interaction among individuals. Three types of compatibility are identified: interchange, originator and reciprocal. Interchange compatibility requires that "two people should be similar with respect to the interchange variable (Schutz, 1966, p. 106), whether the variable is interaction, power, or love. Originator compatibility requires that one person will desire to initiate behavior as much as another person wants to receive it. Reciprocal compatibility "is based on the assumption that the expressed behavior of one member of a dyad must equate the wanted behavior of the other member, and vice versa" (Schutz, 1966, p. 107).

An interesting aspect of Schutz' theory is that it subsumes several extant theories of interpersonal orientations. Thus, "Horney's 'moving away from people' corresponds to the area of inclusion; . . . 'moving against people' corresponds to the control area; . . . and 'moving toward people' corresponds to the affections area" (Schutz, 1966, pp. 45-47). Schutz also noted that Leary and the Kaiser Group's dimensions of dominance-submission and affiliation-hostility "are quite clearly related to our affection and control areas" (1966, p. 48). Finally,

Filsinger's (1981) construct of Liking People comprises a specific elaboration of Schutz's affection need.

Schutz developed an elaborate system of scoring and measurement that has been appled in several diverse investigations of communicative interaction (Rosenfeld & Frandsen, 1972; Rosenfeld & Jessen, 1972; Reddy, 1972). Although experimental success has been somewhat mixed, the theory itself is certainly heuristic.

Personality Trichotomies

An intuitively appealing trichotomy is to characterize individuals as self-, interaction-, or task-oriented. A self-oriented individual is egocentric and selfish. An interaction-oriented individual is "concerned with the group as a means for forming friendships, sharing things with others, providing security of belonging, and helping foster strong interpersonal relationships" (Lake, Miles, & Earle, 1973, p. 217). Task-oriented individuals are interested simply in achieving the objectives at hand. This set of orientations is measured by the Orientation Inventory (ORI) developed by Bass (Bass, 1967; Ganeson, 1975; Lake et al., 1973). Rubin and Brown (1975) and Swap and Rubin (1980) elaborated a construct of interpersonal orientations (IO) in which high IO's are other-oriented and low IO's are self-oriented. These various conceptualizations are found in Warrick's (1972) explication of Democratic, Directive, and Adaptable leaders in management contexts and in Mann's (1967) discussion of a more complex set of managerial and leader orientations.

A similar construct of personality orientations is found in European and Russian psychological literature. These orientations take three basic forms:

1. Motives having to do with concern for one's own success, prestige, pleasure, power, etc. These are self-directed motives.
2. Motives having to do with concern for other people, toward love for them, i.e., group affiliation, altruism, etc. These are social motives.

3. Motives arising from the intrinsic desire to understand reality and physical events, expressed in the need for knowledge, productivity, creativity, and activity (Neimark, 1976, p. 6).

In order to make systematic observations of group process, Mann (1967) devised a member-to-leader scoring system, based on group members' feelings in three areas: the impulse area; the authority relations area; and the ego state area. "The impulse area is divided into two subareas, hostility and affection, and the ego state area is also divided into subareas of anxiety and depression. The authority relations area is considered one of the five subareas" (Mann, 1967, p. 41).

A slightly more complex category-system is offered by Heyman and Shaw (1978) in the form of relationship constructs. The authors identified an orthogonal set of constructs labeled reciprocity, egocentrism, exchange and altercentrism. "In this scheme relationships are presumed to be construed in terms of the actor's perception that he and/or the other has rights and obligations. The actor's perceived rights are presumed to be equivalent to the other's perceived obligations and vice versa" (1978, p. 223). Thus, an actor adopting a reciprocity construct perceives "that both parties are ultimately bound by mutual rights and obligations" (pp. 234-235). Egocentrism is "the perception that the actor has rights over the other but that the other does not have rights over the actor" (p. 235). Exchange is "the perception that neither party has, ultimately, any rights or obligations in relation to the other" (p. 234). Altercentrism is "the mirror image of egocentrism as reciprocity was the mirror image of exchange" (p. 236).

Another trichotomous picture of interpersonal adaptive styles is proffered by Edwards (1973). According to Edwards (1973), "Three primary modes of adaptive social interaction are open to the individual" (pp. 132-133).

Cooperational interaction is characterized by reciprocity to and understanding of the needs of others, and resolution of social conflicts through

personal sacrifice.

Instrumental interaction reflects a preference for dealing with situations by structuring them and through close reliance upon lines of authority, similarity of interest, and adherence to tradition and custom.

Analytic interaction is characteristically represented by a tendency to deal with people and situations through exploration of other than existing or normative courses of action (pp. 132-133).

Performance Styles

Although all of the foregoing constructs are heuristic and potentially very useful to communication research, there is yet another construct that warrants examination. The conceptualization of performance styles engendered by Ring and Associates (Ring, Braginsky, & Braginsky, 1966; Ring, Braginsky, Levine & Braginsky, 1967, Ring & Wallston, 1968) is based largely upon the works of Goffman (Goffman, 1959, 1969, 1971, 1974, 1976/1979). Goffman (1976/1979) speaks of a "behavioral style" as "a choreography through which participants present their alignments to situated activities in progress. And the stylings themselves consist of those arrangements of the human form and those elaborations of human action that can be displayed across many social settings, . . ." (p. 6). Ring and Associates extended this notion into Goffman's dramaturgical metaphor. Behavioral styles are represented as performance styles in those interpersonal contexts in which advantage is to be found in controlling one's impressions. Behavioral styles represent consistent expressions of interpersonal alignment, and most situations require some degree of performance; therefore, Ring et al. (1966) postulated that individuals will develop consistent performance styles based upon their motivations, knowledge and skills in performing.

In order to differentiate performance styles among individuals, Ring and Associates (1966) delineated a tripartitie typology labeled p, r, and c. A p is a poor performer whose needs are not very gratifiable in interpersonal

encounters, who is deficient in impression-management and successful performance, and who does not have a knowledge or repertoire of scripts to "play." Thus, p's are dissatisfied by any encounter in which they cannot simply "be themselves."

An r is a polar opposite of a p. An r is skilled in interpersonal relations and enjoys performing. An r therefore has needs that are gratifiable through interpersonal communication, who has the social adroitness and agility to perform successfully, and has a varied repertoire of performance capabilities. Ring et al. (1966) postulate "that one of the reasons an r desires to give a good performance is that doing so enhances the probability of good outcomes" (p. 213).

A "c is essentially an individual whose behavior is dictated almost completely by the nature of the interpersonal situation. Such an individual becomes the person the script calls for . . ." (Ring et al., 1966, p. 215). Typically c's are not as socially skilled as r's, though more so than p's. It is expected that a c has a high need for social approval and thus, would want to do what is appropriate in any given situation. A c should therefore, "always play a relatively passive, conventional, follower role, never an innovative one" (Ring et al., 1966, p. 215).

Miscellaneous Typologies

Several researchers have attempted to create relatively inclusive typologies of interpersonal orientations and dimensions. Wish & Kaplan (1977) related the dimensions of cooperation, intensity, dominance, formality, and task orientation to relationship type and situational context. Wish, D'Andrade, & Goodnow, (1980) replicated these dimensions in a speech act coding scheme, and Wish (1980) discovered five similar dimensions (cooperative vs. competitive, intense vs. superficial, task oriented vs. nontask oriented, dominance vs. equality, and impersonal and formal vs. personal and informal) underlying the structure of interpersonal communication. Bochner, Kaminski and Fitzpatrick (1977) found that control, nurturance, detachment, affiliation, mistrust and socialbility appeared to

be invariant across two different analyses. Fitzpatrick (1977) found eight factors in typifying relational dimensions: sharing; ideology of traditionalism; ideology of uncertainty and change; assertiveness; temporal regularity; conflict avoidance; undifferentiated space; and autonomy. Factor analytic research of the Interpersonal Style Inventory (Lorr & Manning, 1978) revealed five higher-order factors: socialized vs. withdrawn; autonomous vs. conforming; controlled vs. spontaneous; and stable vs. anxious. Flint, Hick, Horan, Irvine, and Kukuk (1980) found that the dimensions of considerateness, extraversion, task-orientation, verbal facility, and response to the unfamiliar comprised the structure of the California Preschool Competency Scale, and "appeared to be conceptually similar to factors isolated in a number of other research based social competency scales" (p. 203). Finally, after examining the constructs of Leary, LaForge and Associates, Carter, Schutz, Bass, and Longabaugh, Lorr and Suziedelis (1969) administered an interpersonal behavior inventory to three varied samples, and separate factor analyses were performed. Lorr and Suziedelis (1969) began with fifteen basic interpersonal modes: dominance; competitiveness; hostility; mistrust; detachment; inhibition; submissiveness; dependency; abasiveness; deference; agreeableness; nurturance; affiliation; sociability; and exhibition-- each with 7-11 items. The three samples resulted in two 5-factor solutions (nurturance, control, sociability, dependence, and hostility), and one 4-factor solution (nurturance, control, sociability and dependence).

Communication Typologies

Various conceptualizations of personality characteristics have been directly related to communication styles. Bradley and Baird (1977) discovered that different styles of management are typified by different styles of communication:

> Specifically, while all managerial styles positively correlated with some measure of relaxation in communication, democratic managers also communicated in a style which was animated, attentive, and friendly; laissez-faire, atten-

tive and friendly; and autocratic, dominant (Bradley & Baird, 1977, p. 203). Norton (1978) also conceptualized communication style in terms of nine interpersonal variables: dominant; dramatic; animated; open; contentious; relaxed; friendly; attentive; and impression-leaving. Truell (1978) utilized the "Comm-Style" checklist to illustrate " the different wave lengths that people use in communicating with others" (p. 46). Communication wavelengths are describeed by four personality types: the analyzer; the affiliator; the conceptualizor; and the activator (Truell, 1978). Hughy & Johnson (1975) defined communication sensitivity as "the ability to accurately take into account what is going on, to size up the situation effectively, and to evoke an appropriate response" (p. 382). The researchers wrote that the communication attitudes and behaviors of sensitive communicators differ from characteristics of less sensitive communicators, and these characteristics include thoughtfulness, empathy, and flexibility. Communication sensitivity has chiefly been studied by the Conversational Self-Report Inventory (CSRI), which assesses the dimensions of communicative purpose, communicative climate, message reception, message-transmission, message sequencing, and problem management (Neal & Hughy, 1979).

Another similar construct has recently been developed specifically in the field of communication. Hart and Burks (1972) engendered the characterization of rhetorical sensitivity to refer to the person who:

1). tries to accept role-taking as part of the human condition,

2). attempts to avoid stylized verbal behavior,

3). is characteristically willing to undergo the strain of adaptation,

4). seeks to distinguish between all information and information acceptance for communication, and

5). tries to understand that an idea can be rendered in multi-form ways (p. 76).

The RHETSON instrument has been developed to measure rhetorical sensitivity (Hart,

Carlson, & Eadie, 1980) and has already been applied to important communicative concerns (Lange, 1980; Pearson, 1981; Phillips & Metzger, 1975). Both rhetorical sensitivity and communication sensitivity involve concern for understanding, supportive attitudes, adaptability, and role-taking ability.

Summary

In 1975, Golding & Knudson sought to discover the conceptual convergent validity of five interpersonal behavior indices. The present researchers also sought to discover conceptual similarities among the various interpersonal orientations constructs. It was found that four broad dimensions comprised similar behavioral conceptualizations across the interpersonal orientations constructs: an authority relations area (dominance, hostility, control, etc.); a social relations area (affiliation, cooperation, sociability, etc.); an autonomy-dependence area; and a task orientation area (see Table 1). It is interesting to note that while our interpersonal orientations taxonomy resembles the aggressive-dominance, affiliation-sociability, and autonomy dimensions of Golding & Knudson (1975), the present conceptual taxonomy was derived independently of Golding & Knudsons' (1975) research.

Critique

A primary objective of many interpersonal orientations constructs is to simplify or abstract complex human behavior into broad generalizable categories. There is little doubt that collectively and separately, these constructs have described several fundamental dimensions of human action. In doing so, however, most interpersonal orientations constructs have incurred several theoretic and empirical limitations that warrant consideration.

First, most of these constructs are based upon outmoded and obsolete personality theories. For example, Leary's, Horney's, and Jung's psycholanalytic conceptualizations rely on generative forces such as psychic energy, innate anxiety, interpersonal "mechanisms," and even hereditary perceptual proclivities.

Schutz turns to deterministc needs as generative mechanisms. Ring and colleagues assume that individuals possess dramaturgical traits. Communication and rhetorical sensitivity are operationalized as traits, with self-perceptions and general communication-based attitudes serving as generative mechanisms. Trait psychology is no longer entirely acceptable as a theoretic paradigm, especially when human interaction is concerned (Argyle & Little, 1972; Mischell, 1973; Spitzberg, 1981). While behavior can frequently be described in terms of interpersonal orientations, few such constructs possess comprehensive or credible explanatory power.

Second, despite the generic term "interpersonal orientations," most of the constructs are intrapersonal in nature. Most are operationalized by self-report measures, and reference one's perceived interpersonal tendencies. Consequently, several interpersonal concerns are ignored or insufficiently dealt with. Perhaps the most evident concern is the conceptualization of compatibility. Few of these constructs systematically attempt to explain or predict which predominant orientations are compatible, under what conditions, and to what extent compatibility will be manifested. Social styles are said to be compatible when opposite quadrants are occupied. Yet, little research has been performed to actually test this proposition. Schutz alone has elaborated the idea of compatibility and incorporated it as a major facet of his theory.

Third, the relevance of interpersonal orientations constructs to communication is unclear. At a time when communicologists are showing more interest in rules and systems theories, trait- psychology theories appear somewhat limited in their heuristic value. Isolated examples of communication research reveal that interpersonal orientations constructs can be applied to dynamic interaction. Rosenfeld (1972) applied Schutz's theory to small group interaction. Spitzberg & Lane (1981) found that performance styles were significantly predictive of self-perceived communicative competence and communication satisfaction with a specific

conversation. Similarly, productive relevant research is being done with social styles (Lashbrook, et al., 1978; Snavely, 1978). Still, interpersonal orientations constructs generally have not been elaborated in communication terms or correlates. Consequently, their utility for communication theory is currently unclear.

Fourth, the most limiting and problematic oversight of interpersonal orientations constructs is their failure to deal with contexts. None of the conceptualizations reviewed (with the exception of Wish and colleagues) have dealt with the mediating role of contexts in interpersonal interaction. This issue will be taken up in greater detail in the following section. This oversight is partially due to the context-independent generative mechanisms used to explain behavior, and partially because of the complexity of contextual forms and effects. This is an especially important limitation, considering the recent acceptance of developmental conceptualizations of interpersonal relationships. For example, a person's authority orientation may be considerably affected by the interpersonal context; whether intimate or nonintimate. A person may begin a relationship in one predominant mode, and shift to another predominant orientation as the relationship becomes more intimate. Further, a person may shift orientations <u>within</u> contexts, depending upon the orientation being manifested by others. Finally, A's perception of A's interpersonal orientation <u>relative to</u> B's perception of A's orientation may change over the course of a relationship, or even a conversation, depending upon the contextual factors such as intimacy, formality, and friendliness. The role of context in interpersonal orientations theories clearly deserves significantly greater attention than it has received to date.

Theoretical Implications

In this section, an attempt is made to integrate the interpersonal orientations literature into a pre-theoretic predictive framework. Such a move may seem presumptuous considering the unreliability across the studies and approaches reviewed. Therefore, what follows is tempered with the caveat that it be taken as a very tentative beginning step. This step is undertaken by way of illustration. The subject of illustration is the increasingly focal concept of competence in communicating. The centrality of this construct to the field of communication studies is clear (Johnson & Powell, 1981; Spitzberg, 1981; Spitzberg & Cupach, in press). The need to develop predictive models therefore, is also vital.

Competence in communicating concerns the production of messages that are appropriately adapted to their context and effective in their outcomes. Messages are appropriate if they do not violate social and/or interpersonal rules of propriety. Messages are effective if they are preceived to result in desired/desirable outcomes. This twofold criterion has been found to be perceived readily by communicators (Spitzberg & Phelps, 1981; Spitzberg & Canary, 1983) and logically important to the conceptualization of competence (Bochner & Kelly, 1974; Brandt, 1979; Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981; Spitzberg, 1983; Wiemann, 1977). A recent exlpication and test of a model of competence proffers four components: motivation, knowledge, skills, and outcomes (Spitzberg, 1981, 1982, 1983; Spitzberg & Cupach, in press; Spitzberg & Hecht, 1983). As A's motivation, knowledge, and skills in communicating with B in a given context increase, it is expected that A's positive outcomes will increase. While research has been largely supportive of the motivation, knowledge, skills and outcomes components, the context aspect of the model remains largely unexplored.

One way of approaching the role of competence in contexts is through

the concept of interpersonal orientations. Some researchers continue to examine interpersonal orientations as behavioral reifications of personality dispositions (e.g., Buss & Craik, 1980, 1981; Solomon, 1981). However, recently researchers and theorists have begun to recast interpersonal orientations into an entirely different explanatory mold. For example, Goldberg (1981) identifies five fundamental factors of "individual differences":

> Surgency (the fusion of Potency and Activity), Agreeableness (or Coldness versus Warmth), Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Culture (a mixture of intellectual or cognitive aspects of individual differences, such as cultural sophistication, knowledge, and various aptitudes)(p. 159).

This five-factor representation is an integration of eleven different studies (see Table 2). What makes this representation important is Goldbergs' (1981) underlying assumption that "Those individual differences that are of the most significance in the daily transactions of persons with each other will eventually become encoded into their language" (pp. 141-142). That is, language and lingustic forms will come to reflect those aspects of discriminable and salient human behavior which represent basic behavioral and perceptual orientations. Burgoon and Hale (1981) review a number of theorists from a variety of epistemological perspectives and conclude that the basic interpersonal orientations apply to the evaluation of relational messages as well. Their research revealed four factors of relational message evaluation: emotionality/arousal, intimacy/attraction/trust, nonimmediacy, and control. It is quickly evident that this set of factors mirrors those identified by Schutz (1966: affection, inclusion, control), Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (1957: evaluation, potency, activity), and Mehrabian (1980: pleasure, arousal, dominance). The confluence of these varied fundamental dimensions led Heise (1980) and Smith-Lovin (1979) to conjecture that humans possess three basic evaluative dimensions of

perception: evaluation (good, nice, vs. bad, awful), potency (powerful, big vs. powerless, weak), and activity (fast, young, noisy, vs. slow, old, quiet).

The importance of these evaluative dimensions is that they appear to provide a universal (Osgood, May & Miron, 1975; Triandis, 1978) base for the evaluation of both persons and contexts. The relevance of this assumption to competence becomes clear when one simplifies and extends a method developed by Heise and Smith-Lovin. Since both persons and contexts are evaluated along the same set of fundamental dimensions (or lexical universals) our impression of any given event is a function of the conguence of these dimensions for both person (behavior) and context. The surprising simplicity of this approach is illustrated by Smith-Lovin's (1979) research-based speculations:

> if an actor engages in an act that is not in keeping with the pace or tempo of the surrounding social environment, he or she may lose evaluation (i.e., other's opinions of the actor may be lowered). Engaging in very active expressive behaviors (for example, dancing or playing) in a very quiet place (for example, a church or library) might lower others' evaluation of the actor, as might quiety and withdrawn behavior in a place were lively, expressive behavior is usual. Conversely, behavior appropriate to the setting may enhance evaluation (p. 41).

Thus, if applied to competence, a person's perceived competence is contingent on the person X situation congruence of the person's behavior along a given set of evaluative dimensions.

However, the concept of "context" is broader than that of situation (or environment) (Baxter, 1981; Cupach & Hazelton, 1982). In order to elaborate a rational set of analytic dimensions for predicting the impression-formation of a person's competence in interaction, the schema of Thomas and Bookwalter (1982) is adapted (see Table 3).

According to this schema, certain questions are relevant to strategic assessment of a communicative context. If the research of other theorists is applied to this set of heuristic questions, a relatively comprehensive

schema of evaluative dimensions is derived. The working hypothesis being advanced is that the degree to which a person is perceived to be communicatively competent is contingent upon the degree to which actual behavior manifested in a given context is congruent with a perceiver's evaluative expectancy for behavior in each of the contextual facets. While this is no doubt a somewhat crude and tentative predictive schema, it nevertheless comports with much interpersonal orientations literature and some initial research in impression formation. It simply requires a metaphorical shift from viewing interpersonal orientations as reifications of personality to viewing them as fundamental ways of evaluating and perceiving events. It is hoped that such a shift will help to enhance the theoretical utility of the interpersonal orientations literature and research.

Table 1

Dimensions of Interpersonal Orientations

Authority Relations Area	Social Relations Area	Autonomy-Dependence Area	Task Orientation Area
DOMINANCE	AFFILIATION	AUTONOMY	TASK ORIENTATION
Bradley & Baird, 1977	Bochner, Kaminski,& Fitzpatrick, 1977	Filsinger, 1981	Bass, 1967
Conte & Plutchik, 1981	Filsinger, 1981	Fitzpatrick, 1977	Edwards, 1973
Golding & Knudson, 1975	Golding & Knudson, 1975	Golding & Knudson, 1975	Flint et al., 1980
Lefton et al., 1977	Neimark, 1976	Lorr & Manning, 1978	Lake et al., 1973
Norton, 1978	Truell, 1978	Mann, 1967	Snavely & Clatterbuck, 1980
Wish, 1979			Wish, 1979
Wish & Kaplan, 1977	COOPERATION	MISC AUTONOMY	Wish & Kaplan, 1977
Wish, D'Andrade, & Goddnow, 1980	Conte & Plutchik, 1981	Conte & Plutchik, 1981 (confident; self confident)	Wish, D'Andrade, & Goodnow, 1980
HOSTILITY	Edwards, 1973	Lake et al., 1973 (self oriented)	
Conte & Plutchik, 1981	Leary, 1951	Rubin & Brown, 1975 (risk taking propensity)	
Flint et al., 1980	Rubin & Brown, 1975	Shostrom, 1967 (independent)	
Lefton et al., 1977	Wish, 1979		
Lorr & Suziedelis, 1969	Wish & Kaplan, 1977	DEPENDENCE	
Mann, 1967	Wish, D'Andrade, & Goodnow, 1980	Conte & Plutchik, 1981	
Neal & Hughy, 1979		Leary, 1951	
	SOCIABILITY	Leary & Coffey, 1955	
CONTROL	Bochner et al, 1980	Lorr & Suziedelis, 1969	
Bochner, Kaminski, & Fitzpatrick, 1977	Conte & Plutchik, 1981	Mann, 1967	
Lorr & Suziedelis, 1969	Lorr & Manning, 1978	MISC DEPENDENCE	
Schutz, 1966	Snavely & Clatterbuck, 1980	Conte & Plutchik, 1981 (submissive)	
	Wish et al., 1980	Lefton et al., 1977 (submission)	
ASSERTIVE	INTERACTION ORIENTATION	Shostrom, 1967 (The Clinging Vine)	
Conte & Plutchik, 1981	Bass, 1967		
Fitzpatrick, 1977	Edwards, 1973		
Parsely & Lashbrook, 1976	Lake et al., 1973		
	NURTURING		
	Bochner et al., 1977		
	Knapp et al., 1978		

Table 1
(continued)

Authority Relations Area	Social Relations Area	Autonomy-Dependence Area	Task Orientation Area
COMPETITIVE	RESPONSIVE		
Leary, 1951	Leary, 1951		
Wish, 1979	Parsley & Lashbrook, 1976		
Wish & Kaplan, 1977	Shostrom, 1973		
Wish, D'Andrade, & Goodnow, 1980	INFORMAL		
AGGRESSIVE	Wish, 1979		
	Wish, D'Andrade, & Goodnow, 1980		
Conte & Plutchik, 1981	FRIENDLY		
Golding & Knudson, 1975			
Leary, 1951	Bradely & Baird, 1977		
Leary & Coffey, 1955	Norton, 1978		
Horney, 1972	Wish, D'Andrade, & Goodnow, 1980		
Shostrom, 1973			
AUTHORITARIAN	SUPPORTIVE		
Mann, 1967	Knapp et al., 1978		
Rubin & Brown, 1975	Neal & Hughy, 1979		
	Snavely & Clatterbuck, 1980		
AUTOCRATIC			
Conte & Plutchik, 1981	MISC		
Leary, 1951	Conte & Plutchik, 1981 (agreeable, affectionate)		
MISC	Fitzpatrick, 1977 (sharing)		
Conte & Plutchik, 1981 (dictatorial)	Flint et al., 1980 (considerate)		
Knapp et al., 1978 (challenging)	Lefton et al., 1977 (warmth)		
Rubin & Brown, 1975 (machiavellian)	Lorr & Manning, 1978 (interpersonally involved)		
Shostrom, 1967 (The Dictator & The Bully)	Mann, 1967 (affection)		
Warwick, 1972 (directive leader)	Ring et al., 1966 (r)		
	Schutz, 1966 (inclusion)		
	Shostrom, 1973 (capacity to develop intimate contact)		

	0	I	II	III	IV	V
Osgood	Evaluation	Potency Activity				
Kuusinen	Evaluation	Potency Activity	Tolerance	Conscien-tiousness	Self-Confidence	Rationality
Peabody	Evaluation	Assertiveness		Impulse-Control		
Leary	Intensity	Dominance	Affiliation			
Wiggins		Dominance	Affiliation			
Cattell		Exvia	Cortertia	Superego Strength	Anxiety	Intelligence
Norman		Surgency	Agreeableness (Warmth)	Conscien-tiousness	Emotional Stability	Culture
Guilford		Social Activity	Paranoid Disposition	Introversion	Emotional Stability	
Eysenck		Psychoticism Extroversion	Introversion		Neuroticism	
Buss		Activity	Sociability	Impulsivity	Emotionality	
Block				Ego Control	Ego Resiliency	

Table 2. Alternative Varieties of Structures for Personality Characteristics (Adapted from Goldberg, 1981, p. 158).

References

Allen, R.R. & Brown, K.L. (Eds.) Developing Communication Competence in Children. Skokie, IL: National Textbook, 1976.

Argyle, M., Furnham, A., & Graham, J.A. Social Situations. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Argyle, M. & Little, B.R. Do personality traits apply to social behavior? Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 1972, 2(1), 1-33.

Bass, B.M. Social behavior and the orientation inventory: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 1967, 68(4), 260-292.

Baxter, L.A. The fundamental attribution error in interpersonal communication research. The Communicator, 1980, 10, 25-42.

Becker, P., Mok, P., & Bledsoe, L. The Strategic Woman. Dallas, TX: London Enterprises, 1977.

Bledsoe, J.L. Why, when, and how to use each of your four communicating styles. Training, 1976, 13(3), 18-21.

Bochner, R.P., Kaminski, E.P., & Fitzpatrick, M.A. The conceptual domain of interpersonal communication behavior: A factor-analytic study. Human Communication Research, 1977, 3(4), 291-302.

Bochner, A.P. & Kelly, C.W. Interpersonal competence: Rationale, philosophy, and implementation of a conceptual framework. Speech Teacher, 1974, 23(4), 270-301.

Bradley, P.H. & Baird, J.E. Jr. Management and communicator style: A correlational analysis. Central States Speech Journal, 1977, 28(3), 194-203.

Brandt, D.R. On linking social performance with social competence: Some relations between communicative style and attributions of interpersonal effectiveness. Human Communication Research, 1979, 5(3), 223-237.

Buchholz, S., Lashbrook, W.B., & Wenburg, J.R. Toward the measurement and processing of social style. Paper presented at the International Communication Association convention, Portland, OR, April 1976.

Buros, O.K. (Ed.) Personality tests and reviews. Highland Park, NJ: Gryphon, 1970.

Burgess, W., Lashbrook, W.B., Wenburg, J.R., Larsen, D., & Lashbrook, V.J. An experimental study of the effects of training in managing interpersonal relationships (MIR). (c) Wilson Learning Corporation, July 1980.

Burgoon, J.K. & Hale, J.L. Dimensions of relational messages. Paper presented at the S.C.A. convention, Anaheim, CA, 1981.

Buss, D.M. & Craik, K.H. The frequency concept of disposition: Dominance and prototypically dominant acts. Journal of Personality, 1980, 48(3), 379-392.

Buss, D.M. & Craik, K.H. The act frequency analysis of interpersonal dispositions: Aloofness, gregariousness, dominance and submissiveness. Journal of Personality, 1981, 49(2), 175-192.

Clark, R.A. & Delia, J.G. Topoi and rhetorical competence. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1979, 65(1), 187-206.

Cohen, J.B. An interpersonal orientation to the study of consumer behavior. Journal of Marketing Research, 1967, 4(3), 270-278.

Conte, H.R., & Plutchik, R. A circumplex model for interpersonal personality traits. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1981, 40(4), 701-711.

Cupach, W.R. & Hazelton, V. A language-action approach to situation. Paper presented at the S.C.A. convention, Louisville, KY, 1982.

Edwards, C.L. Interactive styles and social adaptation. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1973, 87(1), 123-174.

Filsinger, E.E. A measure of interpersonal orientation: The liking people scale. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1981, 45(3), 295-300.

Flint, D.L., Hick, T.L., Horan, M.D., Irvine, D.J., & Kukuk, S.E. Dimensionality of the California preschool social competency scale. Applied Psychological Measurement, 1980, 4(2), 203-212.

Foa, U.G. Convergences in the analysis of the structure of interpersonal behavior. Psychological Review, 1961, 68(5), 341-353.

Freedman, M.B., Leary, T.F., Ossorio, A.G., & Coffey, H.S. The interpersonal dimension of personality. Journal of Personality, 1951, 20(2), 143-161.

Ganesan, V. A revised method of administration and scoring for Bass Orientation Inventory. Indian Journal of Psychology, 1975, 50(3), 263-274.

Goffman, E. Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience. New York: Harper Colophon, 1974.

Goffman, E. Relations in public. New York: Harper Colophon, 1971.

Goffman, E. Strategic interaction. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1969.

Goffman, E. The presentation of self in everyday life. New York: Doubleday, 1959.

Goldberg, L.R. Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), Review of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 2. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1981, 141-165.

Golding, S.L., & Knudson, D.M. Multivariable-multimethod convergence in the domain of interpersonal behavior. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1975, 10(4), 425-448.

Hart, R.P. & Burkes, D.M. Rhetorical sensitivity and social interaction. Speech Monographs, 1972, 39(2), 75-91.

Hart, R.R., Carlson, R.E., & Eadie, W.F. Attitudes toward communication and the assessment of rhetorical sensitivity. Communication Monographs, 1980, 47(1), 1-22.

Heise, D.R. Understanding events: Affect and the construction of social action. New York: Cambridge University Press, 198 .

Heymon, B. & Shaw, M. Constructs of a relationship. Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 1978, 8(3), 231-262.

Horney, K. Our inner conflicts: A constructive theory of neurosis. New York: W.W. Norton, 1945.

Hughy, J.D. & Johnson, A.W. Speech communication: Foundations and challenges. New York: Macmillan, 1975.

Indvik, J. & Fitzpatrick, M.A. The cause of conecptual clarity: An explication and elaboration of the basic dimensions of relational life. Paper presented at the S.C.A. convention, New York, 1980.

Johnson, J.R. & Powell, R.G. What do we know to teach? Taking theory into the classroom. Paper presented at the S.C.A. convention, Anaheim, CA, 1981.

Jung, C.G. Psychological types or the psychology of individuation. (H.G. Baynes, transl.). Great Britain: Pantheon, 1964. (Orig. Pub. 1923).

Kilmann, R.H. & Thomas, K.W. Interpersonal conflict-handling behavior as reflections of Jungian personality dimensions. Psychological Reports, 1975, 37, 971-980.

Knapp, M.L. Social intercourse: From greeting to goodbye. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1978.

Knapp, R.R., Shostrom, E.L., & Knapp, L. Assessment of the actualizing person. In P. McReynolds (Ed.), Advances in psychological assessment, Vol. 4. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1978.

Knutson, P.K. Perceptual discrepancies in teacher communication style: Both sides now. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association convention, Portland, OR: Feb. 1980.

LaForge, R. Interpersonal checklist (ICL). In J.E. Jones & J.W. Pfeiffer (Eds.), The 1977 handbook for group facilitators (Sixth annual). La Jolla, CA: University Associates, 1977. (88-96).

LaForge, R. & Suczek, R.F. The interpersonal dimension of personality: III. An interpersonal checklist. Journal of Personality, 1955, 24(1), 94-112.

Lake, D.G., Miles, M.B., & Earle, R.B. Jr. Measuring human behavior. New York: Teachers College Press, 1973.

Lange, J.I. Rhetorical sensitivity and understanding. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association convention. Portland, OR, Feb. 1980.

Lashbrook, V.J., Lashbrook, W.B., Larsen, D.C., & Buchholz, S.W. An empirical investigation of the relationship between perceived social style and interpersonal conflict in an organizational setting. Paper presented at the National Communication Association convention, Chicago, IL, 1978.

Leary, M.R. Interpersonal orientation and self-presentational style. Psychological Reports, 1979, 45(92), 451-456.

Leary, T. & Coffey, H.S. Interpersonal diagnosis: Some problems of methodology and validation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 50(1), 110-124.

Leary, T.F. & Coffey, H.S. The prediction of interpersonal behavior in group psychotherapy. Group Psychotherapy, 1954, 7(1), 7-57.

Lefton, R.E., Buzzota, V.R., Sherberg, M., & Karraker, D.L. Effective motivation through performance appraisal: A dimensional strategies approach. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1977.

Lorr, M. & Manning, T.T. Higher-order personality factors of the ISI. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1978, 13(1), 3-7.

Lorr, M. & Suziedelis, A. Modes of interpersonal behavior. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 8(2), 124-132.

Lorr, M. & Youniss, R.P. An inventory of interpersonal style: Journal of Personality Assessment, 1973, 37(2), 165-173.

Lyons, J., Hirschberg, N., & Wilkinson, L. The radex structure of the Leary interpersonal behavior circle. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1980, 15(3), 249-257.

Mann, R.D. Interpersonal styles and group development. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967.

Mehrabian, A. Basic dimensions for a general psychological theory. Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain, 1980.

Mehrabian, A. & Ksionzky, S. Categories of social behavior. In D.C. Speer (Ed.), Nonverbal Communication. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1972, 49-60.

Mehrabian, A. & Russell, J.A. An approach to environmental psychology. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1974.

Mischel, W. Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. Psychology Review, 1973, 80, 252-283.

Neal, W.F. & Hughey, J.D. Personality correlates of communication sensitivity and general sensitivity. Paper presented at the S.C.A. convention, San Antonio, TX, Nov. 1979.

Neimark, M. Personality orientation. NJ: Educational Technology, 1976.

Norton, R.W. Foundation of a communicator style construct. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4(2), 99-112.

Osgood, C.E., May, W.H., & Miron, S. Cross-cultural universals of affective meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975.

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.C., & Tannenbaum, P.H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Parsley, M.L. & Lashbrook, W.B. The relationship between social style, interaction and interpersonal attraction. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association convention, Nov. 1976.

Patton, B.R. & Giffon, K. Interpersonal communication: Basic text and readings. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Pearson, J.C. The relationship between rhetorical sensitivity and self-disclosure. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association convention, San Jose, CA, 1981.

Pfeiffer, J.W., Heslin, R., & Jones, J.E. Instrumentation in human relations training. La Jolla, CA: University Associates, 1973. (2nd Ed. 1976).

Phillips, G.M. & Metzger, N.J. Intimate communication. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976.

Progoff, I. Jung's psychology and its social meaning. Garden City, NY: Anchor-Doubleday, 1973.

Ring, K. & Wallston, K. A test to measure performance styles in interpersonal relations. Psychological Reports, 1968, 22(1), 147-154.

Ring, K., Braginsky, D., & Braginsky, B. Performance styles in interpersonal relations: A typology. Psychological Reports. 1966, 18(1), 203-220.

Ring, K., Braginsky, D., Levine, L., & Braginsky, B. Performance styles in interpersonal behavior: An experimental validation of a theory. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1967, 3(2), 140-159.

Reddy, W.B. Interpersonal compatibility and self-actualization in sensitivity training. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1972, 8(2), 237-240.

Rosenfeld, L.B. & Frandsen, K.D. The "other" speech student: An empirical analysis of some interpersonal orientations of the reticent student. Speech Teacher, 1972, 21(4), 296-302.

Rosenfeld, L.B. Compatibility and interaction in the small group: Validation of Schutz' FIRO-B using a modified version of Lashbrook's PROANA5. Western Speech, 1972, 36(1), 31-40.

Rubin, J.Z. & Brown, B.R. The social psychology of bargaining and negotiation. New York: Academic, 1975.

Schutz, W.C. The interpersonal underworld. Palo Alto: Science & Behavior, 1966.

Shostrom, E.L. Man, the manipulator. New York, Bantam Books, 1967.

Smith-Lovin, L. Behavior settings and impressions formed from social scenarios. Social Psychology Quarterly, 1979, 42(1), 31-43.

Snavely, W.B. A contextual theory of social style in primary relationships: Exploratory research. Paper presented at the International Communication Association convention, Chicago, IL, 1978.

Snavely, W.B. Impact of social style upon person perception in primary relationships. Communication Quarterly, in press.

Snavely, W.B. & Clatterbuck, G.W. The impact of social style on person perception and attraction across three relationship contexts. Paper presented at the S.C.A. convention, New York City, NY, Nov. 1980.

Solomon, M.J. Dimensions of interpersonal behavior: A convergent validation within a cognitive interactionist framework. Journal of Personality, 1981, 49(1), 15-26.

Spitzberg, B.H. & Cupach, W.R. Competence in communicating: Approaches and new directions. Beverly Hills: Sage, in press.

Spitzberg, B.H. Competence as knowledge, skill, and impression. Communication Education, 1983, in press.

Spitzberg, B.H. & Hecht, M.L. A test of a component model of relational competence in naturally occurring conversations. Paper submitted to the International Communication Association convention, Dallas, TX, 1983. (u.r.)

Spitzberg, B.H. & Canary, D. Attributions of loneliness and relational competence. Paper submitted to the International Communication Association convention, Dallas, TX, 1983. (u.r.)

Spitzberg, B.H. Relational competence: An empirical test of a conceptual model. Top Three Student Award paper presented at the International Communication Association convention, Boston, MA, 1982.

Spitzberg, B.H. Performance styles, interpersonal communication competence, and communicative outcomes: An empirical examination. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association convention, Denver, CO, 1982.

Spitzberg, B.H. & Phelps, L.A. Conversational appropriateness and effectiveness: Validation of a criterion measure of relational competence. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association convention, Denver, CO, 1982.

Spitzberg, B.H. Competence in communicating: A typology, review, critique, and predictive model. Paper presented at the S.C.A. convention, Anaheim, CA, 1981.

Cupach, W.R. & Spitzberg, B.H. Relational competence: Measurement and validation. Top Three paper in BSIG presented at the Western Speech Communication Association convention, San Jose, CA, 1981.

Thomas, M. & Bookwalter, R.B. Clarifying context and appropriateness in communication rules. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication convention, Denver, CO, 1982.

Triandis, H.C. Some universals of social behavior. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1978, 4(1), 1-16.

Truell, G.F. Communication styles: The key to understanding others. The Personnel Administrator, 1978, 23(3), 46-48/64.

Warrick, D.D. The effect of leadership and adaptability on employee performance and satisfaction. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, August, 1972.

Wiemann, J.M. Explication and test of a model of communicative competence. Human Communication Research, 1977, 3(3), 195-213.

Wiggins, J.S. Circumplex models of interpersonal behavior. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), Review of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 1. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1980, 265-294.

Wish, M. Dimensions of dyadic communication. In S. Weitz (Ed.), Nonverbal communication: Readings and commentary. (2nd ed.), New York: Oxford, 1979.

Wish, M. & Kaplan, S.J. Toward an implicit theory of interpersonal communication. Sociometry, 1977, 40(3), 234-246.

Wish, M., D'Andrade, R.G., & Goodnow, J.E. Dimensions of interpersonal communication: Correspondences between structures for speech acts and bipolar scales. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 39(5), 848-860.

Wissmiller, A. & Lockwood, D. An exploratory study of social styles and reward contingencies. Paper presented at the International Communication Association convention, Philadelphia, PA, May 1979.

Yeakley, F.R. Jr. Implication for rhetorical and communication theory in Jung's theory of psychological types and communication styles. Paper presented at the S.C.A. convention, San Antonio, TX, Nov. 1979.

Zemke, R. From factor analysis and clinical psychology: Better ways to help train people. Training HRD, 1976, 13(8), 12-16.